



NATIONAL CADET ADVISORY COUNCIL  
CIVIL AIR PATROL  
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AUXILIARY  
105 S. HANSELL ST, BLDG 714  
MAXWELL AFB AL 36112-6332

07 Jan 2006

MEMORANDUM FOR NHQ/CP

ATTENTION: Mr. Curt LaFond

FROM: National Cadet Advisory Council

SUBJECT: Commentary on Draft 52-16

1. This memorandum details the commentary of the National Cadet Advisory Council on the proposed revision to CAPR 52-16. Each of the items found in the "Summary and Rationale" was examined; those which are included here are ones which we do not agree with. If an item from the "Summary and Rationale" is not included here, it may be concluded that the National CAC supports the change proposed by that item.
2. Mission Statement  
The council feels that too great a focus is placed on the creation of "aerospace leaders". The focus should be placed upon the creation of civic-minded, dedicated volunteer leaders, with or without a focus on aerospace. A rewording is recommended.
3. Challenge Option  
The NCAC is firmly opposed to any sort of Challenge Option being implemented in the Cadet Program and has consistently held this viewpoint for the last year. The standard must be exactly that – a standard. We strongly oppose the ratification of this regulation if the Challenge Option will be included in it.
4. Milestone Award Exams  
The NCAC approves of the idea of separating the exams in the manner of the Spaatz Examinations. This will help to bring all the milestone award examinations in line with the end goal, the Spaatz Examinations, thus making cadets better prepared for the final challenge.

However, the standards recommended for the tests are greatly reduced from previous standards, which would be a gross error in judgment. The Mitchell Award examination drops from 100 questions to 75, with only 25 questions dedicated to leadership. This reflects both a lowered standard and also seems to signify that the emphasis placed on leadership is less than the emphasis placed on aerospace.

We recommend that equal tests be given in each field for each of the milestone awards, excepting the Wright Brothers Award. For instance, the Mitchell Award Examinations should be composed of a 50 question leadership examination and a 50 question aerospace examination, and so on for the remaining milestone award examinations (50 aerospace and 50 leadership questions for the Earhart Award and for the Eaker Award). Aerospace and leadership must remain equally important in the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program.

Further, it is stated that the cadet will only be tested on the concept which they have learned over the past Phase. However, when the cadet takes the Spaatz Examinations, they are tested over their cumulative knowledge of the Cadet Program. Milestone Awards denote both the completion of a Phase of the Cadet Program, and a certain level of mastery of the program as a whole. In addition, testing over the entirety of the knowledge a cadet has gained will help to further prepare them for the

Spaatz Examinations. Milestone Award Exams should encompass all knowledge gained as a cadet thus far, not just the previous Phase.

5. Staff Duty Analysis

With the deletion of the Staff Duty Analysis (SDA) from promotion requirements, one of the last meaningful writing and communication assignments in the Cadet Program is being removed. While the SDA program has been historically poorly implemented, there is no suggestion of how to retain the writing and paperwork instruction that the program offers. It is suggested that some kind of writing assignment be added to each promotion, having to do with leadership and squadron organization. Conversely, a service requirement might be considered for each milestone (similar to the Encampment requirement for the Mitchell Award). Finally, an additional writing assignment might be added to the Earhart or Eaker.

While the removal of the SDA program is not necessarily a bad idea, it must be replaced by other tests of professional competency in the area of written communication and organization.

6. Aerospace Education at Achievement 1

The council is worried that the inclusion of a “hands-on” aerospace education event during the first achievement might unnecessarily strain the abilities of local units. The system in place works fairly well and we see no reason to change it.

7. Aerospace Outreach

While a laudable concept, the idea of having CAP cadets spend time educating the public on aerospace education in order to receive promotion is one riddled with possible difficulties. Squadrons in rural areas who are unable to find a public audience for their cadets to help teach will be in an unfortunate position of having to hold back cadets based on their location, not on their skill level. While aerospace outreach should be encouraged, it should not be made a part of promotion requirements.

8. Aerospace Career Explorations

While another excellent concept, the inclusion of Aerospace Career Exploration speech assignments comes at the price of leadership-related speech topics. As a program designed to develop dynamic youth leaders with an understanding of aerospace, the Cadet Program cannot afford to replace all the speech requirements on leadership with speech requirements on aerospace. The speech requirements for Achievement 8 and for the Eaker Award are good topics already in place, and there is no reason to change them. Adding an Aerospace Career Exploration to the Earhart Award, with a writing requirement as well as a speech requirement, would be a better idea, as it would address somewhat the loss of the Staff Duty Analysis program.

Similarly, a good-faith effort should not be considered a passing attempt. The real world is much less forgiving of good-faith attempts, as any college student can tell you. Attempts which meet the standard of conduct which Civil Air Patrol sets should be considered passing, not attempts which are attempts. The Cadet Program succeeds precisely because it is challenging and offers real and engaging opportunities to youth; it does not do this by being easy, but rather by being hard.

9. Physical Fitness in Achievement 1

As stated by one of the representatives, “I thought that the purpose of the orientation period was to orientate; yet we are still orientating them once they have joined.” (Jamie Hurley, Southwest Region) If a cadet is in such poor shape as to be unable to pass the Curry Physical Fitness when they join, there is little chance that two months will allow them to be in passing shape for the Arnold Physical Fitness. There is little reason to drop the PT.

10. In conclusion, most of the changes proposed in this revision seem to be solutions in search of a problem. As has been stated many times, a lot of the problems facing the Cadet Program revolve around the local implementation of the program. In that vein, there is little that is wrong on a national level with the program. Further, the program in its modern format has only been in place since 1 April 2003, a time of less than 3 years. Major structural changes to the program should be postponed until

the program in its current form has a chance to be fully implemented nationwide – an issue which once again returns to the local unit commander.

11. Due to the concerns listed above, the National CAC cannot endorse this regulation for ratification at this time.

On behalf of the National CAC,

THOMAS A. REHMAN, C/Lt Col, CAP  
Chair  
National Cadet Advisory Council

cc:  
CAP/CC  
NCAC Egroup  
Brig Gen Anderson  
Col Courter